

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated February 4, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,212,517 (Sato et al.).

By the present response, Applicants have canceled claims 8 and 9 without disclaimer. Applicants have amended claims 1, 3-5, 7 to further clarify the invention. Applicants have submitted new claim 10 for consideration by the Examiner and submit that this claim does not contain any prohibited new matter. Claim 1-7 and 10 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sato et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Sato et al. discloses providing keywords to facilitate a search in a text retrieval system. For each of text constituting a text base, the system creates a word ID of each of words used in the text and a word occurrence count of a corresponding word. The word occurrence count indicates a number of occurrences of a word in each text. For each of words used in any of the text constituting the text base, the system creates a total word occurrence count and a containing text count indicative of the number of text containing the word. For each of words contained in the selected text, a degree of importance is calculated by using the word occurrence count, the total word occurrence count and the containing text count. The words

contained in the selected text are sorted in order of the degree of importance. At least a part of the sorted words are displayed as related keywords.

Regarding claims 1 and 5-7, Applicants submit that Sato et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, calculating the importance of words contained in a document set, whereby the difference between the word distribution in a subset of every document containing a specified word and the word distribution in a set of whole documents including the subset is used to calculate the importance of the word. The Examiner asserts that these limitations in the claims of the present application are disclosed in the abstract, Figs. 7-13 and col. 1, lines 53-61. However, these portions of Sato et al. merely disclose that for each of words contained in the selected text, a degree of importance is calculated by using the local statistical information for the selected text and the global statistical information, and that the words contained in the selected text are sorted in order of degrees of importance. Sato et al. discloses the word importance being calculated by using "WOr(Wj)" which is the number of occurrences of a word Wj in a retrieved text RTr and "RCT(Wj)" which is the number of retrieved texts which contain a word Wj (see col. 5, lines 58 - col. 6, line 32). Therefore, in Sato et al. the word importance is calculated by the comparison with the frequency of the subset and the frequency of the whole documents. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to the word importance being calculated not by the frequency but by distribution. In the claims of the present application, it is calculated how much the distribution of the other words appeared with the specified word is

different from the standard distribution then the word importance is defined.

Sato et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 2-4 and new claim 10, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. For example, Applicants submit that Sato et al. does not disclose or suggest the difference being determined by comparing the distance D between the subset and the set of whole documents with the distance D' , or the estimated value of D' , between another subset of documents which contain substantially the same number of words as the subset of documents and are randomly selected from the subset of whole documents and the set of whole documents, or the difference being defined by the equation noted in claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Sato et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-7 and 10 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-7 and 10 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/642,771

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 501.38779X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 312-6600